

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. | |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|--|
| 09/520,580 | 03/08/2000 | ANDREW E FANO | AND1P529 | 1890 | |
| 29838 75 | 590 10/06/2004 | | EXAM | EXAMINER | |
| OPPENHEIM | ER WOLFF & DONNE | VU, THANH T | | | |
| PLAZA VII, SU 45 SOUTH SEV | JITE 3300 VENTH STREET | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | | |
| - + | S, MN 55402-1609 | | 2174 | | |
| | | | | | |

DATE MAILED: 10/06/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| · | | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------|--|--|--|--|
| Advisory Action | | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | | | |
| | | 09/520,580 | FANO ET AL. | | | | | |
| | | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | | |
| | | Thanh T. Vu | 2174 | | | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address | | | | | | | | |
| THE REPLY FILED 16 August 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. | | | | | | | | |
| PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)] | | | | | | | | |
| a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | | | | | | | | |
| 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. | | | | | | | | |
| 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because: | | | | | | | | |
| (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); | | | | | | | | |
| (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below); | | | | | | | | |
| (c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or | | | | | | | | |
| (d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. | | | | | | | | |
| NOTE: | | | | | | | | |
| 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s). | | | | | | | | |
| 5.⊠ The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet. | | | | | | | | |
| 6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be raised by the Examiner in the final in | | ecause it is not directed SOLEL' | Y to issues which w | ere newly | | | | |
| 7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. | | | | | | | | |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will | be) as follows | S: | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) allowed: | | | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) objected to: | | | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) rejected: | | | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | | | | | | | |
| 8. The drawing correction filed on is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner. | | | | | | | | |
| 9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s) | | | | | | | | |
| 10. □ Other: Writtine Kinicaid | | | | | | | | |
| | | KRIS | TIME KINCAID | | | | | |
| | | SUPERVISOF TECHNOL | RY PATENT EXAMINE OGY CENTER 2100 | н | | | | |

Application No.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants argue that the specification adequately described the claim limitation "plurality of non-temporal preferences" at page 28, lines 6-11 and page 31, lines 14-17. The applicants refer to quality or priority as a non-temporal preference. The examiner does not agree for the following reasons:

Non-temporal means not relating to time. In the specification, Users can adjust their expectation for time and quality by negotiating tradeoff between time versus quality for a given goal. As illustrated in fig. 7, users can adjust the slider bar 708 to position between "Time" and "Quality". Setting the bar 708 closer to quality side of the bar increases the favoring of quality while decreasing the favoring of time, while setting the level of the bar towards the time side of the bar increases the favoring of time while decreasing the favoring of quality (see the specification page 31, lines 6-12 and lines 18-20). From the foregoing, the time element is always there.

Therefore, Claims 20-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claims 20 and 30 require "a plurality of non-temporal preferences". However, there is a lack of written description in the specification to clearly describe the subject matter. It appears in the specification that the plurality preferences are either directly or indirectly related to time in order for a user to make financial decision by negotiating tradeoffs between various personal financial goals. The examiner assumes that the application meant "a plurality of references" and the rejections as set forth in the Final Office Action are based on that assumption.